DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 218 EA 002 388

Planning Educational Change Volume IV. How Five School Systems Desegregated.
Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Report No-OE-38013
Pub Date 69
Note-28p.
Available from-Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (FS 5.238 38013, $.40).
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
Descriptors-*Community Study, Community Support, Educational Innovation, Federal Programs, Inservice Teacher Education, *Integration Methods, *Integration Plans, *Public School Systems, Racial Balance, School Community Cooperation, *School Integration, Student Teacher Relationship, Transfer Programs

This document contains case studies of school desegregation programs implemented in five school systems: Chapel Hill, North Carolina, Chattooga County, Georgia, Riverside, California; Rochester, New York; and Sherman, Texas. The case studies illustrate a variety of techniques and methods available for dealing with such recurring problems of school desegregation implementation as school-community relationships, teacher-pupil interaction, facilities utilization, transportation, teacher training, finance, and educational innovation. Related documents are EA 002 386 and EA 002 387. (JH)

ED030218

PLANNING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE: VOLUME IV. HOW FIVE SCHOOL SYSTEMS DESEGREGATED

OE-38013

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Robert H. Finch, Secretary

James E. Allen, Jr., Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Education

EA 002 388

Superintendent of Documents Catalog No. FS 5.238:38013

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

Washington: 1969

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402 - Price 40 cents

PREFACE

This volume contains sketches of school desegregation programs implemented in five school systems: Chapel Hill, North Carolina; Chattooga County, Georgia; Riverside, California; Rochester, New York; and Sherman, Texas. The programs were chosen to illustrate application of some of the principles discussed in Volumes I, II, and III of the series **Planning Educational Change.**

Each community is unique. No one program can be set up as a model for other school systems. Rather, taken collectively, these five programs attest to the fact that desegregation can be accomplished, and that it can be accompanied by an increase in the quality of education available to all children, whatever their racial, cultural, or economic backgrounds.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	Chapel Hill, North Carolina	1
II.	Chattooga County, Georgia	5
III.	Riverside, California	9
IV.	Rochester, New York	15
V.	Sherman, Texas	23

I. CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA

Among southern communities, Chapel Hill is in many ways a favorable site for leadership in race relations. It is above all else a university community. Its social makeup, economic existence, cultural activities -- even the architectural style of its small downtown -- are all dominated by traditional and present functioning as a university town. For this reason several factors have uniquely influenced the desegregation program of the Chapel Hill public school system.

Although the total Chapel Hill township population is about 50,000, that number includes university students, leaving the population of Chapel Hill and nearby Carrboro, which towns comprise the Chapel Hill City School District, at about 24,000. Since 1950 Negroes have made up about 20 percent of this population.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has long challenged the area with progressive ideas, having borne a reputation of liberalism almost since its founding. Many families depend in one way or another upon the university for livelihood. White university personnel are chiefly composed of teaching staff, hospital staff, and skilled technicians. Part of the white university community is rooted in the area, but there is also a rather frequent change in the upper-middle-class white population, related to a fairly constant turnover in the university teaching staff. Thus the white population tends to be well-educated, affluent, and open to new influences.

The Negro community also relies to a large extent on the university for work. But in contrast to the whites, Negroes traditionally have worked almost solely in menial positions. They have comprised the maintenance and cleaning staffs, the orderlies and aides in the hospital, and the unskilled work force of the town businesses. Also in contrast to the white community, the Negro community has been almost totally stable, with generations of roots in the area. Such stability came about in part because of the job assurance that the university offered.

More subtly, the university may have influenced the Negro community by putting a damper on professional aspirations of Negroes who chose to remain in the area. In many segregated communities, Negroes, finding it almost impossible to receive sufficient service from local professional people such as physicians and dentists, have developed their own professional cadres. But because the university offered professional services to all of its workers, there was little incentive among Negroes to pursue white-collar occupations. This influence even reached the academic community of Negroes to some extent, for since there was little promise of vocational diversification, schooling was of no great economic advantage. The community leadership among Negroes, until the decade of the 1960's, remained essentially in the local ministers of churches, plus a small number of dedicated teachers. Recently Negroes have been employed on the teaching faculty of the university, and a general increase has occurred in the number of Negroes in most local white-collar occupations. Desegregation brought together the children of these widely divergent backgrounds, creating classrooms with unusual disparity among children.

The pressure to desegregate Chapel Hill's schools came about no more from demands of the Negro community than from the growing conviction among white citizens that the maintenance of a dual school system was both undesirable and, in so small a community, economically unfeasible.

Perhaps because of the lack of urgent pressure from any one group and the apathy which exists to some degree in any tranquil and tradition-conscious community, desegregation in Chapel Hill proceeded slowly at first. At the beginning of the decade there were three Negro students in the white schools, one of whom was there by

court order. By 1962 small-scale desegregation had been instituted by changes in geographic assignment, by the entrance of a few Negro students into the white junior high school, and by the assignment of two white teachers to Negro schools. Negro students were given open transfer options, and in 1963 the school board ruled that teachers would no longer be hired for particular schools, but as employees of the total system. In the fall of 1963 a new school became the first racially mixed elementary school, and discussions began concerning a projected new high school.

In the spring of 1964 the first powerful protest activity in the Negro community occurred. Though its target was mainly discrimination in public accommodations such as restaurants and movie theaters, it influenced the school board to look ahead to some basic changes. In planning for the new high school the board and the administration began to think in terms of one large high school for the whole district. The superintendent announced to the students of the Negro secondary schools that eventually their schools would be phased out.

Things moved slowly, however, due in part to the fact that between 1961 and 1967 Chapel Hill schools were under four different superintendents. Thus the accomplishment of change in this community, unlike that in many small towns, depended almost entirely on the school board rather than the administrator. In spite of this diffusion of responsibility, dedicated individuals kept insisting that the burden of decision should rest upon all of the citizens, not just upon the Negro parents, to decide which school their children should attend. In early 1965 freedom-of-choice forms were sent to all parents of school children, and free choice was encouraged by several policies and campaigns.

The board decided that the Negro junior and senior high schools would cease to exist when:

1. There were fewer than 80 pupils in grades 7, 8, and 9;
2. There were fewer than 80 pupils in grades 10, 11, and 12; or
3. Good educational progress could not be maintained because of small numbers.

The board passed resolutions, in addition, that consolidation would in no way affect teacher hiring, and that no member of the staff or school board should in any way influence freedom of choice. These policies resulted in more racial diversity, but left the Negro schools still unmixed. Furthermore, the better students of the Negro schools had chosen to attend the white schools, leaving the segregated schools without student leadership and without the most active and influential Negro parents.

At this point the Chapel Hill citizens combined forces in small meetings, individual appeals, door-to-door visits, and informal contacts to encourage dispersion of the remaining Negro students. This campaign resulted in total desegregation by May 1966; but the fortuity of the process had left the school system with some technical problems, as well as with the numerous educational and social problems that would result from change.

Since the transportation policy that accompanied freedom of choice provided for all sorts of criss-crossing, the process became both expensive and administratively hectic. In the spring of 1967 the school board decided that a better system of desegregation could be achieved by abandoning freedom of choice for geographic zoning. Four zones were drawn for grades 1–5 with inclusion of residential areas in such a way as to produce in each zone a 22 percent to 33 percent ratio of white and Negro students, approximating that of the town as a whole. The formerly Negro secondary school was used as a system-wide 6th grade.

Relations between the Negro community and the administration were enhanced by the fact that a group of Negro leaders, who had the support and trust of the Negro community, fully sympathized with the administration's plan. Negro teachers as a group were also very supportive.

In 1967 the present superintendent, Dr. Wilmer Cody, took over the administration of the school system, which was at last totally and feasibly desegregated. His task, as he sees it, is to carry out an educational program that assures continual progress in integration of the school faculties and students and in closer ties between the schools and the community.

One of Dr. Cody's early moves upon taking office was to call upon the Human Relations Center at St. Augustine's College in Raleigh, funded under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for consultation. With the Center staff serving as consultants an institute for 70 teachers was held for 3 days before school opened. This institute proved helpful, but faculty and administration agreed that more intensive preparation was needed.

Some major concerns included resegregation within the classroom, teacher-student relationships, and tremendously varied achievement ranges. In seeking to handle the latter, Chapel Hill had grouped students by ability. However, many professional personnel felt the practice was detrimental to pupils of low achievement, both Negro and white. Teachers were already struggling on their own to individualize instruction, especially in basic skills.

A fourth concern was the area of community relations. When Negro children were segregated, their parents had been very active in the school program. As the schools gradually desegregated there was a decline in participation of Negro parents, both in formal school-related activities and in individual contact with teachers.

A proposal for a Title IV grant for inservice training to help teachers deal with these and other concerns was submitted, and the program began in January 1968. All professional personnel in the system took part in it. A special team of beginning teachers, designated as "staff teachers," taught enrichment classes and relieved the regular faculty to participate in the training program.

A major component of the spring and summer workshops was the study of teacher-pupil interaction. The Flanders Interaction Analysis System, Reinforcement Theory, micro-teaching, and other methods of observing and influencing human interaction were explored. Teachers' reactions to these workshops were favorable as to the effectiveness of the methods and the general sharing of ideas. However, many felt that the time involved in such detailed analysis made it impractical for them. Another negative criticism was that the workshop had been needed earlier.

Staff teachers also participated in inservice training, attending workshops on such subjects as curriculum, school organization, and community relations. Among the products of these workshops was a book on curriculum enrichment. Staff teachers who stayed for a 2d year (1968-69) as regular teachers exhibit as a group a freshness of approach which makes them eager to institute continual improvements. Several of these 2d-year teachers related this attitude to a certain sense of openness and mutual concern developed during the 1st year. They felt that the administration and faculties had been especially supportive of them as 1st-year teachers.

The inservice workshops for the 1968-69 school year include a followup on interaction analysis but place major emphasis on establishing closer relationships with parents and on making curriculum changes. A new group of staff teachers relieves regular teachers to attend seminars, work with parents, and make visits to

Negro businesses, churches, and community organizations. A parent workshop was held to demonstrate ways in which parents of 1st-graders can help their children at home.

In addition to the Title IV program, other projects are supporting the integration effort. A communications project funded under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) seeks to coordinate oral language development with reading programs. Special teachers funded under Title I ESEA work specifically with children from educationally deprived homes. Materials developed in this program will be distributed in a curriculum guide.

A cooperative program between universities and colleges in the area is allowing the Chapel Hill school system to obtain an integrated slate of student teachers. By providing student teachers the opportunity to teach in desegregated schools it may influence future teachers' career choices and may encourage more direct training for integration on the part of university departments of education.

Though the teacher is always at the center of educational change, the students themselves provide the most direct evidence of success or failure. In Chapel Hill students seem especially well-adjusted to the change. Though Negro students originally had some hesitation at entering the full round of secondary school activities, a large number now are involved in clubs, sports, and organizations. Of particular interest is the formation of a biracial council of students for integration. Starting in 1967-68 with about 35 students, the group now numbers about 200.

The high school principal, noting the ease with which students made the transition, pointed out that one positive factor may have been that it was not just the Negro students who moved. A new high school was opened in the year when total desegregation occurred, creating a new environment for both white and black students. Furthermore, the building was not totally finished when school opened, and a certain group spirit was established among the students as they worked together on minor carpentry jobs.

The staffing pattern in Chapel Hill may have had some influence on student integration. Two elementary schools are headed by Negro principals, and teaching assignments have been made without regard to race. Children may find it much easier to think nonracially because they have role models to follow.

Students can also look to the community leadership for an example of racial harmony. Recently Howard N. Lee, a Negro, was elected mayor of Chapel Hill. Though desegregation of the schools did not directly bring this about, certainly, as Dr. Cody points out, it helped to create the climate for an election in which race was not a factor.

There have been problems and conflicts. Teachers animatedly argue the merits and dangers of ability grouping, which still continues to some extent. Children inevitably run into frustrations and disappointments as they seek to redefine their roles in an integrated setting. In spite of an excellent guidance staff, there is not time for enough indepth counseling. Too many Negro students lag behind in achievement and grades, and too many Negro parents hesitate to approach the schools.

These problems, however, are in a sense made visible by overall success. The process of complete integration is an ongoing one, but the enthusiasm of the Chapel Hill faculty, administration, and community has given the school system a running start.

II. CHATTOOGA COUNTY, GEORGIA

Chattooga County in northwest Georgia includes part of the majestic Chattahoochee National Forest as well as endlessly rolling farmland. Its appearance might lead one to believe it was insulated from the forces of change observable in places like Atlanta and Chattanooga, its nearest big-city neighbors.

The county school system has definitely and speedily desegregated all of its seven schools, along with the faculty of about 128 white and 16 Negro teachers. The student population of Chattooga County is about 15 percent Negro.

School reform actually began in 1952 when the number of schools was reduced by consolidation from 14 to seven over a period of several years. The theme then, as now, was "better education." When the present superintendent, Mr. James Spence, began to think in the early 1960's of continued improvement of the school system, the next logical step seemed to be to comply with national law by ending segregation. At that time there were two Negro schools, about 12 miles apart, sharing one principal. Furthermore, throughout the county system, which includes all of the county except the small independent district of Trion, he noted that facilities were not well distributed. There was overcrowding in some cases and underutilization in others.

Adoption of the freedom-of-choice plan had resulted in only about 30 Negro children choosing to leave their school, so that two separate school systems remained in a district with limited funds and personnel.

Meanwhile, a survey team was called in from the Georgia State Department of Education. Their recommendation, to insure maximum utilization of facilities and personnel, was to close out the two Negro schools and adopt a plan for desegregation by geographic zoning.

The practicality of the plan was obvious. It would mean that funds could be concentrated more directly on programs and would relieve the system of some of the transportation difficulties encountered in bringing Negro children from the various small towns into Summerville and Holland, where the Negro schools were located.

The appeal of the plan to the community was less certain. Though there was little history of overt hostility between the races in Chattooga County, white citizens held all the fears about desegregated education that are common throughout the country.

Still considering the issue, representatives of the Chattooga County System attended a conference in Atlanta in March 1966, to discuss school desegregation with members of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. At their request a call was made to Washington, D.C., asking for consultants to come to Chattooga County to hold public meetings. After these public discussions, the school board met and voted total desegregation of the public schools. Upon announcement of this decision there was, in the words, of Mr. Spence, "a lot of howling and gnashing of teeth for several days."

However, the community had a few months, from April to August, to become accustomed to the idea. During that interval the superintendent accepted all invitations offered him, from "anyone who would listen," to speak on the subject. He obtained the backing of the Ministerial Association and local civic groups, as well as that of certain individuals and school personnel. Presenting the issue as one of simple fairness and obedience to law, he won over many citizens. In addition, the principal of the Negro schools worked constantly as a liaison agent between the Negro community and the white leaders, making sure that the Negro community

was fully aware of and in support of the plan. Nor did it hurt the case for desegregation that the children of both the superintendent and the school board president would be attending desegregated classes in one of the formerly all-Negro schools. By the time school was ready to open, a sufficient number of people were either won over or convinced to take a nonresistant posture that the plan could go into effect smoothly and quietly.

Geographic zoning was a fairly uncomplicated matter, since there was no attempt to create exact racial balance throughout the county. The elementary school in each small town simply took in the Negro elementary students, grades 1–8, in the area, while the formerly Negro school in Summerville was converted to grades 5 and 6 for all children in the Summerville area. All high school pupils in the system attended the new Chattooga County High School. No staff members were dropped as a result of desegregation, and the former principal of the Negro high school is now guidance coordinator for the county.

The years following desegregation have found the majority of local citizens still holding a "wait and see" attitude, but several occurrences have indicated that support for the change is strong and growing. One of these was last year's county vote for superintendent, which vindicated Mr. Spence's position by overwhelmingly reelecting him over a man who had challenged him on the issue of school desegregation. Other less spectacular but important indications of community support are expressed in parents' reactions. For instance, at the beginning of the program it was thought that parents would be more at ease if students spent only half a day with a white teacher and the other half with a Negro teacher. This plan of organization was dropped after 1 year with teachers being accepted for their teaching ability regardless of race. This initial reaction to desegregation of the faculty helped pave the way for the beginning of team teaching and other educational innovations that were instituted along with desegregation. A certain faith in the school administration was established, with a willingness to allow experimentation.

Perhaps one of the greatest factors in the success of the desegregation program was the inservice training for all teachers, financed under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This program included summer workshops as well as weekend and evening workshops and seminars throughout the 1968-69 school year.

Some consultants for the inservice program were brought in from other school systems and from nearby colleges and universities. However, insofar as possible, master teachers already on the Chattooga County faculty were utilized in demonstrations and discussions, thus encouraging participation as well as a certain amount of healthy competition in good teaching performance. Teachers came to know the special skills existing among their own staff and to give mutual support to each other. Workshops focused on study of the nongraded school, team teaching, departmentalization, and use of materials and equipment. A summer laboratory school furnished opportunities to observe and practice new teaching methods, and the emphasis was on participation rather than lectures.

In connection with the summer laboratory school the first team-teaching project in Chattooga County was instigated, along with a demonstration 8th-grade classroom which continued into the school year. Children with learning problems were chosen for this classroom, and it was furnished with modern equipment supplied through Title I ESEA. The 8th grade was chosen for this project with the idea that children at this age might be prevented from dropping out of school if they received special attention before reaching 16.

The training program, besides offering teachers valuable assistance, spurred their participation in the overall planning of the school program. Out of the activities of the program grew several study projects, conducted by teachers working with the curriculum director, on educational methods. Team teaching, individualized instruction, and the nongraded school are being explored; and the curriculum is being examined for its

relevance to the new student body composition. Ways are being sought to encourage more participation of Negro students in the full round of school activities.

In addition to the study programs and the laboratory class, several team-teaching projects are now going on in the high school with English and social studies. Care has been taken to keep equal status and responsibility between the two races in team organization and assignments.

A preschool project has proved highly successful both in improving the 1st-grade readiness of disadvantaged white and Negro children and in involving parents in the school program. Operated as a pilot project through the Southeast Education Laboratory, it utilizes mobile caravan units purchased from a Connecticut community and driven down to Georgia. Two teachers operate the program, making regular weekly stops at eight back-country points. The "lessons," carefully planned to relate to the experiences of 4- and 5-year-olds, utilize audiovisual presentations. Since the children are brought by their mothers, parental contact with the educational staff is begun and the mothers participate informally in the program.

Teachers' reactions to desegregation have been generally positive. Though responsibilities have increased, aides have been employed in many instances to relieve teachers of some of the routine classroom work. From the beginning faculty meetings were open to discussion of ideas and problems related to desegregation. White teachers wanted Negro teachers to succeed, and so tried to be receptive both socially and professionally.

Some Negro children's grades went down with desegregation, but parents seemed to understand that this did not mean the children were failing to progress. One parent remarked that even though her child was now making lower grades he seemed to be learning more. Parents are kept aware of school events by direct mailings. At first Negro parents hesitated to come in for conferences on grades or other concerns; but by taking time to talk with them and keep them informed, the school faculties and administrators have broken down many of the barriers.

With Negro students there had been some original hesitation, too. They were encouraged, however, to take part in sports, cheerleading, clubs, and other activities. Negro students are now serving as officers in several school organizations.

Desegregation has been accompanied by an expansion of school facilities. Programs of cultural enrichment, reading improvement, industrial arts, home economics, mathematics, and physical education have all been improved through Title I ESEA. Title II ESEA has been utilized to improve school libraries by increasing the number of books and achieving balance of categories of reading material.

At present instructional problems occupy the center of educational concern in Chattooga County. Much of Mr. Spence's formula for lasting success in desegregation consists of proving that the quality of education will not only continue at its previous level but will actually improve. The indications at present, in view of the innovations now in progress, are that such will be the case.

III. RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA

In 1964 the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People awarded a plaque for outstanding service to the Riverside Unified School District for its compensatory education program. In September 1965, irate leaders of the minority community confronted school leaders with complaints that the schools were not answering the social and educational needs of minority children, and presented a petition calling for immediate closing of de facto segregated schools. On the surface it would appear that in 1 year there must have been downhill progress in providing equal educational opportunities. In reality the compensatory program had actually improved, both in scope and quality, but a change had taken place within the minority community. The time was ripe for a new kind of action.

Plans for desegregation had been considered in Riverside as early as 1961. Certain school zone boundaries had been adjusted to alleviate de facto segregation and an open transfer policy had been adopted to allow minority children to avoid attending segregated schools. Teachers had always been hired and placed on the basis of personal qualifications, and there had been no difficulty when minority teachers were placed in predominantly Caucasian schools. Nor had superintendent Bruce E. Miller and the school board been totally out of touch with the minority community. The compensatory education program was set up in 1963 only after consultation with minority leaders, and communication had been maintained through a Human Relations Council. Then, on Labor Day weekend in 1965, 1 week prior to the opening of school, one of the segregated elementary schools was half destroyed by fire.

School board president Arthur L. Littleworth and board members, meeting the next day, faced an overflow crowd and demands for total desegregation "now". A petition signed by about 400 people called for immediate closing of the two predominantly Negro schools.

What had indeed come about, almost in a weekend's time, was a substantial shift in leadership of the minority community. Three weeks earlier Watts had erupted in nearby Los Angeles. The mood in Riverside had changed from smoldering discontent to volatile demand for action.

The next day it was learned that a movement was afoot to boycott the schools. By the California allotment system, a cutdown in school attendance could mean considerable financial loss. Recognizing the tight situation, the board president, using several intermediaries, arranged a meeting with local citizens involved in the boycott movement. After consulting each school board member individually, he met with the local coordinators to present a tentative plan for transporting the children displaced by the fire to various schools throughout the system.

This plan was discussed with the community, with the boycott proceeding meanwhile, in several meetings. These meetings, often stormy, brought board members to the realization that total desegregation was the only acceptable answer. In the Negro community the feeling was widely and deeply held that no compensatory or token program was satisfactory. Finally the minority community decided to give the school board the 30 days they had requested to create a desegregation plan, and the board publicly stated its full commitment to total desegregation.

The plan which was subsequently developed was in itself fairly simple, with no exceptional technical aspects. It called basically for exactly what the petition had requested: the closing of the two predominantly Negro schools and the dispersal of their students throughout the district by September 1966. In addition a third segregated school in a Mexican-American neighborhood was to be phased out.

The children would be transported to other schools where the minority enrollment had not exceeded 15 percent. An attempt would be made to make the racial makeup of each school match that of the district as a whole -- 17 percent minority, with a maximum minority enrollment of 17.8 percent and a minimum of 8.5 percent. From the beginning there was an attempt to see that classroom makeup matched these school figures as much as possible. Since resegregation could result from residential changes in the future, provision was built into the plan for making boundary readjustments from time to time.

To accommodate the new students in the schools with low minority enrollments, portable classrooms were brought in and paid for with insurance money from the burned building. At the beginning, implementation of the plan put some strain on district facilities, and the total operating cost of the desegregation plan amounted to about $14,000 per year for the first 3 years, going down to about half that amount in following years. But with an overall annual school budget of about $15 million this was not by any means a prohibitive cost.

The attractive simplicity and comparatively low cost of this plan greatly enhanced its acceptance by the community. A major selling factor was the clear communication maintained with all parents through the teachers. They talked directly with parents on an individual basis, giving details about children's assignments and all changes in school procedures.

The partially burned school was no longer used by the educational system, but was sold and its proceeds applied to the school budget. One of the other two schools was utilized as a model reading clinic funded by Title III ESEA, and both were used for classes for the educationally handicapped and for Head Start. The school which was phased out also began to function as a community center and housed adult education classes.

To supplement local school funds the administration knocked at every door, private and public, in order to pay for its new programs. Though the technical aspects of the plan were comparatively inexpensive, new educational programs and inservice training workshops, which were deemed necessary to assure increased quality in education, called for large expenditures. Funds were obtained under the Economic Opportunity Act, Titles I, II and III of ESEA, Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, State McAteer Funds, Titles III and V of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), and others. The administration soon found that in many cases the desegregation plan gave Riverside high priority in consideration for funding.

Since the beginning of desegregation quite significant and far-reaching changes have occurred in the educational approaches within the system. At first special programs centered mainly on extensive attention to reading, liaison work in the community, and inservice training for teachers who would receive minority children into their classes. The reading program was two-pronged, being directly partly toward the disadvantaged child (under Title I ESEA) but also including a special model reading clinic for all children of the district (Title III ESEA).

Related to the reading program were the opening of new libraries in several elementary schools and the acquisition of 16,764 new books, supplemented by ESEA Title II. These programs included resources to help teachers deal with special academic problems.

In addition, teachers were aided by the inservice programs which were held at various schools, beginning just after the implementation of the desegregation program. After some early inservice training programs in the summers of 1965 and 1966, it became apparent that more extensive training was needed for teachers. A departure was made in 1967 from the traditional lecture-type program, since teachers had not seemed

noticeably aided by previous efforts and soon lost their initial enthusiasm. Financed under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the 1967 inservice program sought to involve a wide spectrum of school personnel and citizens. In addition to teachers and administrators, participants included teacher aides, custodians, board members, parents from various ethnic and economic groups, and personnel from city and county police, probation, recreation, and welfare programs.

The emphasis was on involvement, carefully developed and led by skilled practitioners. Small-group discussions, open confrontations of feelings and fears, and situations that brought together a variety of life styles and backgrounds were arranged. Content was broadened from discussion of school desegregation to the root considerations of change, under the heading "Education in Transition."

The participants' responses to these workshops were highly favorable, and there was evidence of significant increases in positive attitudes toward the school program. It was felt that this inservice training program had much to do with the success of integration in the schools and with development of better understanding between the schools and the community.

The Home-School Project was set up under Title I ESEA to insure contacts between parents and the schools their children attended. Each principal was asked to arrange for parent and child visitations, and community education aides contacted all parents individually, making sure that they had transportation and babysitters as needed. The activities of this project range from consultation on the child's progress in school to family counseling sessions, vocational guidance, social services, and liaison between parents and teachers. In addition to community education aides, the staff includes a vocational counselor, a psychologist, and a psychiatric social worker.

Activities of the Office of Economic Opportunity, especially Head Start and the Neighorhood Youth Corps, were closely coordinated with the educational program. With monetary assistance from NDEA Title V (for Guidance and Counseling) the elementary counseling program focused its efforts on widening horizons and improving the self-images of disadvantaged and minority children. Many programs instituted with the compensatory education plan, such as tutorial help and enrichment programs, were continued.

The Riverside School Study was begun soon after the first steps of desegregation. A cooperative venture with the University of California at Riverside, it was aided by State, U. S. Public Health Service, and foundation funds. It has developed into a multifaceted study of procedural problems involved in desegregation as they affect both the minority children and whites. About 1800 children in the elementary grades were involved, approximately half white and half minority. They were matched by grade to compare both the short-term and long-term effects of desegregation on Negro, Mexican-American, and "Anglo" children.

Though it is still quite early for any solid conclusions to be stated, the study promises to contribute some well-documented findings in this area. Its validity is improved by the fact that the first of a number of sequential measurements was made before desegregation began. School officials made it clear to the community, and especially to the middle-class parents who feared their children's achievement would go down, that the university would be responsible for publishing conclusions, good or bad, independent of the school system. This straightforward approach paid off initially in establishing trust, and it has recently been somewhat vindicated in tentative research findings. While tests have not yet revealed consistent gains in achievement of transferred children, they have shown definitely "that the presence of lower-achieving integrated pupils has not affected the achievement status of the receiving children in the primary grades, where test scores are currently available." Relative to achievement of the minority children, tentative conclusions are that their achievement improves, even after a short time, when they are placed with "motivated pupils." Clustering in a single class or with low-achieving pupils results in continued poor achievement.

Openness on the part of school officials may be an outstanding factor in the success of Riverside's desegregation program. From the beginning, desegregation procedures met with very little resistance, a fact which is somewhat surprising in this community which is often characterized, in comparison with many in California, as conservative. A segment of white parents did present resistance at one point with a petition against desegregation; some upper-middle-class Negro parents, whose children were already in integrated schools, had to be persuaded that they would benefit; and there was hesitance on the part of the Mexican-American community in the Casa Blanca area. Generally, however, the larger community reaction has remained nonresistant if slightly unclear. A school tax override election was lost, but this was at a time when such elections also failed widely throughout California. The next year another school tax override election, for a larger amount, was won. In another election the school board president and the clerk, who had taken firm action for integration, won by large pluralities over an opponent who had challenged them on the integration issue. Subsequently, in November 1968 an $18,500,000 school bond issue received majority support of almost 50 percent of the general presidential election. It failed to pass due to the fact that California requires a two-thirds majority vote on school bond issues. In February 1969 there was a special election which built upon the foundation achieved in the November election. A school bond issue for the same amount passed with a 70 percent majority.

Within the educational community desegregation has been accompanied by an acceleration of educational innovation, and numerous projects are being carried on in individual schools. Beginning in 1966 adult education classes at three schools offered the opportunity to earn high school diplomas and have been well attended. Retraining programs have been established, offering courses such as business skills and driver training.

An outstanding example of innovative educational procedures coupled with desegregation can be seen in the Emerson Elementary School. This school, the one exception to the Riverside racial balance formula, has maintained a minority enrollment of about 50 percent. Originally the student body composition was created by residential patterns, and the school was looked upon as a "transitional" problem school. Middle-class parents complained and were transferring their children to other schools. Staff morale was low.

To avoid a mass exodus from the school, a special program was set up by the district school administration. The first step was to ungrade the school in every way possible. There were no homogeneous groupings; the new goal was individualization of instruction for each child. Teachers were encouraged to forget consciousness of race and poverty and to think of the individual child.

Implementing this program, the school principal requested that the number of minority children at Emerson School should not drop below 30 percent. Racially and economically, the 1964 student body breakdown was approximately: 45 percent upper-middle "Anglo"; five percent lower-income "Anglo"; 35 to 40 percent Negro, of whom about three-fourths were from lower-income families; and the remainder, lower-income Mexican-American.

The reasoning of the administration was that such a high minority and disadvantaged population would force integration, since few school programs would be able to function without including members of several racial and economic groups.

To keep the upper-middle-class population, the school's innovative program was emphasized from the beginning. Later, such public relations efforts were little needed, for the children themselves, as well as their teachers, sold the program by their enthusiasm.

Besides complete individualization of instruction, educational innovations included a special motor development training program, cognitive training and assessment based on the work of Piaget, and a "third culture" anthropological approach to learning.

The "third culture" approach was designed to take children of all racial and economic groups into a culture which was foreign to all, and yet which offered them all a full range of experience. The guiding notion, as set forth in the funding proposal, was that "where classes are heterogeneous the primary class, in the realm of social studies, should look, not to any part or parts of itself, but . . . instead to some 'third' culture."

The whole Emerson faculty functioned as a team to work out these innovations and put them into practice. Working together with the principal, often by trial and error, the teachers developed a strong sense of responsibility for the total school program.

By the end of the 1966-67 school year student and teacher morale were greatly improved, and test scores of the children also indicated substantial growth. There was less teacher turnover and very little complaint from the community. Teachers had become confident in their ability to plan and make educational decisions.

Educational innovations continued to develop. "Cross-age teaching," with older children teaching younger ones, was employed. Cooperative educational and recreational programs were set up with social agencies, local universities, the police department, and the city government. Parents were brought into the program, donating hours to keep the library open longer, to tutor, and to construct teaching materials.

Word circulated and some of the parents who had moved away requested transfer back into the school. One mother gave as her reason concern that her child "should not grow up only knowing the segregation that exists in an Anglo-Saxon wonderland."

As the principal reported, "Perhaps the most important educational innovation of all is 'honest' involvement of teachers in curriculum and instructional policy decisions."

Of the community's involvement in the education of its children, one resident noted that "the school is now an open community effort. It reflects the personality of the community... Children are treated as individuals and parents are asked to contribute their mental and physical aid."

Such a learning environment offers an example of the ideal toward which the whole Riverside school district is moving. Mr. Miller stated this commitment to quality education in implementing the desegregation plan. He said, "We firmly believe, and are confident we will prove over a short period of time, that by increasing the educational opportunities (along with the motivation and all that goes with it) of minority and low socio-economic-level pupils, we will raise the standards of the entire district."

Upon Mr. Miller's retirement, he was succeeded in 1968-69 by Mr. Ray Berry, who had served as associate superintendent. Mr. Berry, who had been active in Riverside's desegregation program, is continuing to emphasize quality integrated education for all Riverside children.

IV. ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

The decision to begin desegregation of Rochester's schools is probably not traceable to any one particular event. For several years before taking its beginning steps, the school system had been studying the situation and seeking ways to reduce racial imbalance in the city schools.

Certain occurrences, however, gave impetus to the planning and implementation of desegregation. In May of 1962, 10 families were taking civil action on the grounds that de facto segregation deprived their children of the right to an equal education. Furthermore, State Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr., during that same year directed each school district in New York State to advise him of the existence of any racially imbalanced schools (more than 50 percent nonwhite), of the local board's policy for establishing and maintaining racial balance, and of plans to eliminate imbalance where it existed.

In August 1963, Rochester's board of education adopted a forthright resolution on racial imbalance which noted that the board "recognizes that one of the functions of the public schools is to prepare children for life in a democratic society" and the board "believes that the fulfillment of this function depends in part on the degree to which children have opportunities during their public school careers to become acquainted with children from a variety of cultures."

Though the overall, long-range plan was still forthcoming, an open enrollment plan was adopted that year, with transportation to be furnished by the school system. Superintendent Herman Goldberg explained how Rochester's open enrollment plan differed from the less successful plans of many cities:

> I analyzed why open enrollment had failed in many other cities and there were two basic reasons: One, the transportation costs became a burden for the family. . . . Second, . . . open enrollment programs suggested in this country failed because the burden was placed on the parent to walk to the school and up to the counter of the secretary or principal and to say, 'I want open enrollment,' to say it verbally, to come and make personal application. And I vowed to eliminate both those hurdles.

Letters were sent to parents in selected Negro residential areas offering the chance to take part in the transfer program. Significantly more letters were received than there were vacancies in predominantly white schools to be filled. Only about 600 applications could be accepted that 1st year.

By the spring of 1965 sufficient contacts had been made, and sufficient success obtained in the open enrollment program, to arouse the interest of suburban school districts. The School Board of West Irondequoit, observing the improvements in the city system and realizing the disadvantages to suburban white children of attending nearly all-white schools, submitted a proposal to admit 25 city 1st-graders to their school system. In 1966, 25 more city children would be admitted, and so on until about 300 Negro children would be attending the school system.

Called the Intercultural Enrichment Program, this plan was designed to help West Irondequoit children with the problem of racial isolation. Until 1965 West Irondequoit had had only four Negro children in a total enrollment of about 5,800.

Students were selected from what was a predominantly Negro school in a transitional neighborhood. These children were chosen partly on the basis of achievement as well, and were matched with a control group

which stayed in the sending school. Tests and followup studies are still being carried out, but the evidence so far indicates higher achievement on the part of the transferred children. White suburban children, too, have gained, possibly spurred on by the presence of the city children in the classroom.

For such suburban transfer projects Rochester pays tuition and provides transportation for the inner-city children. A good part of these costs is reimbursed by Titles I and III ESEA and the State Education Department of New York.

In the summer of 1966 another suburban desegregation project got underway, with an experimental program at the Charles D. Cooper Center for Innovation in Education in which 75 inner-city children attended a summer school on the campus of the State University College at Brockport. This program, similar in many respects to other city-suburban transfer programs, is unique in that the Center for Innovation school, though receiving children from the Brockport community, has a certain degree of freedom by virtue of its connection with the college. It is considered by both the Brockport and Rochester communities to be a legitimate place for educational experimentation, and thus a place where the decision to desegregate did not have to be subject to local mandate. Thus desegregation has received more emphasis than in other suburbs, and the ratio of city children has been held at 20 percent, maintained by replacements throughout the school year. In addition, many of the children were selected for this program from a poverty area so that the city children would make up something of a cross-section of the Negro population of Rochester.

It was expected that these children, coming from varied socioeconomic backgrounds and from a highly authority-oriented school, would have some adjustment problems in the economically well off and relatively unstructured and freer environment of the Center for Innovation school. With a variety of staff--guidance personnel, supervising teachers, practice teachers, participating teachers, graduate assistants, and teacher aides--special attention could be given to inner-city students as they worked out such problems. The campus school has also encouraged experimentation in adapting to the presence of ghetto children. For instance, there is a program for teaching "the dialect and vocabulary of the school and the suburbs as a foreign language," and several teachers are requiring less "politeness" from students and more honesty and direct confrontation in school activities.

In addition to such experimental approaches on the part of individual teachers, the school structure, which includes individualized instruction and team teaching, contributes to a general atmosphere of free expression. Along with desegregation came, according to the director, a new openness and candidness among teachers, administrators, and other school personnel concerning their own personal emotions, hopes, prejudices, and endeavors.

Even in this optimum situation, however, teachers felt a need for special training for working with inner-city children. One teacher commented on "the role of the city children in providing inter-cultural enrichment for the Brockport children" as follows:

> I believe we teachers at the Campus School have been better able to provide individual instruction for inner-city students than their previous schools. I believe teachers need to be trained, if possible, in methods of teaching culturally deprived children. Techniques which a teacher would use with a Brockport student might offend or alienate a Rochester student. Some sort of specialized training is an absolute minimum if the teacher hopes to help the integrative process rather than simply teach in a physically integrated classroom. Teachers should as much as possible come to know the individual backgrounds and problems of the inner-city students.

This need for specialized training was felt even more in other suburban districts to which city children were being transferred. Recognizing this need, the Faculty of Education of the College of Brockport set up a desegregation institute during the 1967-68 school year. Financed under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, this institute provided inservice training, consultation, and other services to personnel entering student transfer programs in the Rochester metropolitan region.

The participants in the 1967-68 institute, who came on a voluntary basis, were primarily teachers, with a few parents and administrators. The 2d year's program was designed for more direct impact on school and community leaders. Superintendents of selected communities chose teams, each of which included administrators, teachers, and representatives of parents' or community organizations. The teams were to serve as consultants to their school boards and administrators throughout the school year. The institute staff gave continuous assistance to these teams as they developed and carried out inservice and community information programs in their districts. Institute plans for 1969-70 call for even more direct influence on school administration, with school administrators being the chief participants.

One of the wide-reaching results of the 1967 summer institute was the formation of the Quality Education Now (QEN) organization, developed by participants in the institute. In 1 year the organization took in over 400 teachers and parents from throughout Monroe County.

QEN was organized to promote quality integrated education, specifically by coordinating activities of interested individuals who wanted to remain free of control or even extensive influence by "establishment" representatives. The organization has cooperated with other similarly independent teacher, parent, community, and civil rights organizations to encourage support of specific school desegregation programs. Through press releases, letters, and appearances at school board meetings and a variety of local organizations, the members generated commitment and action among citizens and educators of the area. Though now this organization is easing in impetus, it has sparked the formation of additional groups, one of which is a federation of inner-city parents working both for increased desegregation and for increased quality in the inner-city schools that remain racially imbalanced at this point.

By the school year 1967-68 five suburban communities were participating in the Urban-Suburban Transfer Plan, and all city schools were taking part to some degree in the open enrollment and reverse open enrollment plan within the city. By this time, though racial balance had not been achieved, there were no all-white schools remaining in the city system. Among the inner-city schools participating, one of the most outstanding in extent of desegregation was an elementary school which received 200 white children from the "outer city." Its program, in the words of an administrator, "demonstrated how children, teachers. administrators, parents, and a community can really take over a school -- not as a 'white school' and not as a 'black school' -- but together!" In addition to the regular school year suburban programs, summer programs involving several suburbs have widened the number of participants. There is now a waiting list of over 100 children wanting to attend this school, and an additional school is involved in a similar program.

Both programs expanded further in school year 1968-69 with the inclusion of greatly increased numbers of children from both suburban districts and city schools. Greater numbers of enrollees in the open enrollment and reverse open enrollment program of the city schools brought the total of transferred children up to about 2,175. This number would have been almost double, judging by the number of volunteers on the waiting list, except for limited facilities and finances.

Within the general progress of desegregation, several schools have developed programs that serve to demonstrate various methods of combining desegregation with outstanding educational innovation. Among these, the World of Inquiry School is a special example and an ideal seldom attained by city or suburban schools.

This school, housed in a plain, square red brick building built in the 1880's, involves little else that is old-fashioned. Here the factor of race is almost incidental in comparison with the total impact of complete integration -- of ability, economic and residential background, age, sex, and personality. The World of Inquiry School is in fact a world in itself -- a projection of the diversity which may well characterize the American community of the future. In it is created a school atmosphere that encourages learning, not just from the printed page or the teacher's words, but from every aspect of human existence -- from electronics media and machines, the arts, group projects and dramatizations, and human relationships.

The racial makeup of the school has been about 60 percent white, 30 percent black, and 10 percent Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Oriental. City children come about equally from inner city and outer city, and about 20 percent are suburban children.

There are no yearly grade divisions, no report cards, and very few fixed groups. Each child has a "family group," based roughly on age. There are also interest areas such as the arts, social studies, math and science, and physical education. Parents learn of their children's progress from detailed records kept by the teachers and discussed in conference.

In the "family room" children begin the day, concentrating on basic language and number skills. Later they may follow their interests, though not without guidance. Each child, along with his teacher, plans out a rough weekly schedule, suited to his own pace. However, the child is nearly always free to follow in the directions his new learning leads. A mathematical discovery may lead him to a new musical learning, or the artistic material he is using may raise new questions in science. Teachers, if at first a bit lost without the old structures, now are totally involved in carrying on innovations in the school and the community.

Foreseeing the end, in June 1970, of the 3-year Title III ESEA grant which is the main support of the World of Inquiry School, a committee is now working to obtain other funds to keep the school in operation. With the provision that the school will remain public, will continue to be operated by the board of education, and will receive the same amount of tax-based funds as other schools in the district, this committee has received permission to enlist the support of foundations, corporations, and individuals for support to blend with official funds. The active involvement of school staff, parents, and community residents in forming and supporting this committee is some indication of the enthusiasm which has been generated by the superb educational program of the World of Inquiry School.

Other schools in Rochester are also moving toward nongraded instruction. A spin-off of the World of Inquiry School is the Satellite School, opened last year in a corner of Sibley's department store. Equipped with the latest technological aids to education, it offers a window on the future to parents and visitors. Besides the one-way viewing window that forms one wall of the classroom, unobtrusively placed TV cameras relay learning scenes through screens placed about the store. Children from various schools make up the fluid "student body" of the Satellite School, and the heavy demand keeps the schedule full evenings and Saturdays.

These two schools are part of the master-plan, project UNIQUE (United Now for Integrated Quality Urban-Suburban Education), which was drawn up for the city system in 1964. With the urban-suburban transfer plan, the model schools form the nucleus of the total project, which is financed mainly by a Title III ESEA grant. In all, there are nine projects in UNIQUE, all coordinated from the unimposing Center for Cooperative Action in Urban Education located in a corner storefront at the edge of an inner-city renewal district. After 3 years of total-effort planning, involving participation of Rochester citizens and teachers as well as nationally recognized educational leaders, UNIQUE was formally instituted in 1967.

Several of the other projects now operating within UNIQUE include components that depend on racial integration. The purpose is not only to give ghetto children a better chance of doing well in school and society, but also to give all children, white and black, a better chance at learning from each other and understanding diversity in school and society.

To bring parents and schools into closer touch, SPAN (School-Parent Advisor to the Neighborhood) was instituted. Its chief aim is to enhance mutual teacher-parent efforts to meet the needs of children. Some areas of concern include prevention of truancy and tardiness, finding ways around children's financial difficulties, and even arranging part-time jobs. SPAN advisors are assigned to specific neighborhoods, where they establish working relationships with both school personnel and parents. Parent meetings are usually held in a "host home," with 10 or 12 parents invited for informal discussion. Such an unstructured situation encourages forthrightness, and SPAN has a good success record so far in bridging the gap between ghetto parents and schools.

Preschool children of the ghetto are the target of another component of UNIQUE, the Community Teacher Project. Trained teachers meet the children -- and their mothers, who serve as teacher aides -- in their homes. The basic aim is similar to that of Head Start, with the added dimension of educating the mother to provide learning incentives, as well as actual help, for her child.

Two other aspects of Project UNIQUE, the Teacher Internship and Urban Education Major programs, encourage master's candidates in the area to concentrate on urban education and to gain first-hand experience by serving their internship in inner-city schools.

Finally, there is the Clearing House for Student Assistance, which offers "opportunity programs," in conjunction with colleges in the Metropolitan Rochester area, to needy high school graduates. These nine components of UNIQUE, along with the institute and demonstration school at the State University of New York at Brockport, comprise the major operations of Rochester's metropolitan desegregation efforts.

Just how well these efforts are succeeding is impossible to state with finality. The process of educational change will be continuing, and conclusions must be considered tentative. Perhaps the best indexes for measurement are the comments of those most directly involved - school faculties, parents, and students.

An elementary teacher in a suburban school described a new classroom atmosphere that developed with desegregation:

> There was not so much modification of anything we've done in this class, as pursuing more that came up that was of interest, or talking more about something we would otherwise just brush over. There was more interest in a lot of things -- often I couldn't tell what connection it might have with having Negroes in the class. Like last February, the film study of Lincoln showed a slave sale. There was considerable discussion of this.

Another teacher said,

> I have noticed that the Negro children relate things in their classroom learning to their home situation more than the [suburban] children have -- this has encouraged the [suburban] children to do more of it.

One suburban principal summarized the attitude of many suburban staff members as follows:

> Academically, seven of the eight [city] youngsters were behind most of the students. Through hard work and desire to improve all but three have scored above grade level on the most recent achievement test. One youngster continues to have academic problems, but there has been evidence there is improvement.
>
> . . .
>
> A general observation is simply -- we have eight additional students who desire to learn, have adjusted well to the school life, are making contributions in their respective classes, and we're delighted they are in our school.

In suburban Brighton a report on the transfer program, written by a parent, stated:

> The Brighton Board of Education's recent policy committed to quality integrated education, the activity of the school's administration in the areas of reviewing resource material, evaluating curricula, and searching for Negro teachers, is indeed positive evidence that these groups are concerned and working for intercultural education for all children. These events can be viewed as effects of the interaction of a supportive Board policy and a working, "successful" program.

These reactions, of course, are overall judgements and do not negate the fact that many problems, and even direct conflicts, have arisen. Many teachers reported that city and suburban children have not tended to form a great number of friendships outside school. Others are dismayed at the wide variations in educational background between suburban and city children. However, many have reported a lessening of such problems with each successive year of desegregation.

Parents of both Negro and white children have expressed a general feeling that progress is being made, though imperfections are frankly pointed out as well. Some sample comments by parents on their own children and the programs are:

> He likes going to school. He seems to have a lot more different classes, such as science and vocal music. He gets to know more people besides those of his neighborhood and nationality.
>
> . . .
>
> I feel some parents could learn from the children. During open house some of them acted as if we had two heads because we're Negroes. The kids act better than their parents.
>
> . . .
>
> It would be nice if there were some parents in the receiving school that would like their children to go to a city school for a while. Just to give the kids a chance to see how other people live. Everything isn't the same as you read in the papers.

My child has improved in her speaking and she just seems more bright. I like the program very much.

. . .

I think it gives children from all walks of life a chance to grow up together and see what a better way of living their generation can be.

. . .

I believe that inner-city schools should be upgraded. This would make the student exchange equally advantageous for the participants.

. . .

He has a very good school behind him, and training. And also that there are a lot of people, other than his own race, that is interested, friendly and nice to work and get along with.

. . .

It seems that my child's interest in school is better. He seems to get more attention from the teachers due to the fact that its not so crowded. He feels that the teacher is interested in his progress.

The most forthright reactions may be those from the students themselves. One Negro high school student wrote of the experience in an exchange program:

> I found suburban companions very friendly, which to tell the truth I didn't expect. And my opinion of them has changed considerably because of this.

Another wrote:

> I have thought of the government as cold and impassive but I realize that any one who would pass an act like this to help us see and understand each other in our own field, must somehow understand. And to do so for free! . . . . It's a wonderful self-less program. I am proud of my government at least if only in <u>this</u> program.

Rochester still has a long way to go before racial imbalance is totally corrected in its city schools. Like most large cities, it is faced with great technical problems in desegregating, in addition to the problem of gaining citizen support. These initial steps, however, are notable in terms of both social impact and educational soundness. Their effect on the whole metropolitan area is pronounced and growing. School desegregation, combined with quality integrated education, is proving itself and gaining momentum among school personnel and students and in the larger community.

V. SHERMAN, TEXAS

The annual preschool workshop of the faculty of the Sherman Independent School District met as scheduled in the late summer of 1953. This year there were two differences from the pattern developed over several years. The group of teachers and administrators met in the First Baptist Church educational building downtown, because it was air-conditioned. The second change was that, for the first time, and after some discussion on the part of the administrative staff, all of the school personnel of the district assembled together -- white and Negro in the same workshop--rather than separately, as in previous years, when white teachers and principals had met with the superintendent and Negro teachers with their school principal. That second change marked the overt beginning of the Sherman story of school desegregation. Implicit in the decision to meet together was the resolve to begin dealing with the Negro faculty in the same manner as with the white faculty.

In reality the beginning goes back some years before, to early ideas and conversations and inevitable decisions on the parts of superintendent Byron Davis and some of the community leaders. Sherman is a small town (1964 population - 29,426) with a student population that is about 11 percent Negro. Mr. Davis knew that his town was rather typical of many small communities in that major change is best brought about from minor beginnings. Sherman's progress in desegregation is characterized not by dramatic confrontations but by the careful implementation of successive steps. One teacher said, "We started early."

In his own story of the desegregation program, Mr. Davis told how an incident of lynching back in 1930 may have provided Sherman citizens with the sharp awareness of racial conflict and the self-examination that would not allow them to pretend, "We have no problem." On the other hand, he also suggested that the remembrance of this incident might have caused community leaders to proceed with more caution than might otherwise have been employed. He told how the incident had affected his action to some degree:

> In every community you have some people who are extremists, and we're no different from most of the communities in Texas. We have that kind of citizen, but fortunately they're in the minority. But we have been influenced in every step that we have taken, because of this incident; and we have been very prayerful that we might be able to bring about the desegregation of our schools, including students and faculty, without any manifestation of racial bigotry.

Approaching the matter of school desegregation with openness and honesty, Mr. Davis moved step by step toward eliminating the dual school system.

At the workshop in 1953 little was said of actual plans for desegregation. The Negro and white faculties remained strangers in many ways. But white teachers and Negro teachers observed each other. They noticed individuals and discussed educational issues together. The Negro teachers were also observed by residents of the community as they moved in and out of this church located in the downtown area. Some citizens inquired about what was happening, and interest was generated in the community.

In 1954 the preschool workshop met again, with some changes. Some of the white and Negro teachers were mixing at coffee break, and in the meetings the groups were not sitting in racially separate blocks. Curriculum planning groups were desegregated, as well as the annual awards dinner. These unsweeping but socially significant steps provided more opportunity for Negro and white professionals as well as some lay citizens and all of the school staff, including bus drivers and cafeteria workers, to meet socially and to begin working together.

During that year the U.S. Supreme Court had made the historic Brown vs. Board of Education decision, but the administration had not been caught off guard. At the same time, Mr. Davis recognized that no real steps had been taken in actual desegregation of the schools and that the time to act concretely had arrived.

In the next school year, 1955-56, a committee was called together to set up tentative plans for desegregation. Two school board members and the ministers of Sherman met with Mr. Davis in the chamber of commerce building, purposely avoiding meeting in an educational building in order to avoid immediate reaction from the community. For many of the ministers it was the first opportunity to meet their counterparts of the other race, and it received local press and radio coverage. The community began to discuss the issue.

In the summer of 1956 the preschool workshop was expanded into a systemwide inservice training program, focusing to a large extent on school desegregation. Meanwhile the community was becoming accustomed to the idea of desegregation through other avenues, as individual citizens worked to bring about change. The chamber of commerce voted to desegregate local restaurants, and interracial groups of citizens interested in such public concerns as education and housing were formed. Those groups still meet, bringing together in an informal way citizens of various professional and economic levels, as well as Negro and white.

In addition, one rather accidental development in the location of the administrative offices may have contributed to communication and understanding between the races. Because of residential changes the number of children in one of the white elementary schools was decreasing each year, while the Negro elementary school was becoming overcrowded. In 1960 the Negro children were transferred to the formerly white school. This was insignificant in terms of student desegregation, but the administrative offices for the district happened to be located in the basement of the building. By keeping his offices there, Mr. Davis may have created bridges between the Negro community and the administration. The mere physical location of the administrative offices in that area brought day-to-day contacts with faculty, students, and even parents which might not have occurred otherwise.

In the summer of 1961 the board of education established a program of preschool education for Negro children who would enter school that fall. It was staffed by two Negro teachers and a white supervisor working under a Negro principal, a situation which illustrated on a small scale a general rule which would hold later in wider faculty desegregation: positions were filled on the basis of ability and training, not by race. It was generally agreed that this 8 weeks' preschool program greatly enhanced the children's readiness for 1st-grade study, and the program continued until 1965, when Head Start was instituted.

These years of preparation show a steady if rather gradual record of progress toward desegregation. Mr. Davis stood at the forefront of educators and other citizens in producing change. Many efforts, such as a proposed school desegregation study group within the PTA, met with resistance and died. Of these failures Mr. Davis says:

> Now all these projects were failures for us. But a lot of good... was coming out of it, because citizens were involved in one way or another in all these discussions.... A lot of thinking was going on; and in spite of these particular projects being failures the groundwork was being laid for the harmonious desegregation of our schools which has occurred up to this point.

By the end of the school year 1964-65 most grades had seen some extent of desegregation due to an open-enrollment policy. That summer a team of five Sherman teachers and principals attended a Human Relations Institute sponsored under Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 at the University of Oklahoma at Norman.

They prepared and presented to the superintendent a statement of their observations and suggestions relative to desegregation and inservice training. This statement emphasized the readiness of the Sherman faculty and community for total desegregation.

Total desegregation at the elementary level came in 1965-66, with the closing of the one Negro elementary school. School buses were desegregated, as well as the Classroom Teachers Association, faculty, and substitute teachers.

During that year several human relations consultants spoke to the Sherman faculty members on problems of desegregation and possible ways to solve them. An inservice program was set up, during 1966-67, to study specific problems, with small groups meeting monthly for discussion. The reports of these small groups comprised what amounted to a plan for the next year's human relations program, and enthusiasm was growing among faculty members.

In December 1966 the board of education announced the decision to close the Negro high school in 1967-68. Only about 175 students were still attending the school, and it was becoming impossible to offer a full program and to keep up facilities for so small a student body. The announcement was made early in order to give the community time to think out any problems ahead of time. By this time, major negative reactions were coming from the Negro community, both parents and students. Mr. Davis expressed his understanding of their feelings as he looked back on this final event in accomplishing desegregation:

> It's somewhat of a traumatic experience to these boys and girls who have been in their school where they were officers in their student councils, officers in their homerooms, officers in their clubs, leaders in their athletics; and a white board of education some night comes along and says, "We're going to stop all this for you and you'll have to move over to Sherman High School."

Because of such hesitations on the part of Negro parents, students, and faculty, special efforts were made to communicate the good faith of the school board. Both Negro and white principals spent hours counseling with students and parents of the two races, exchanging student and faculty handbooks, and assuring the Negro community that all school functions were open equally for participation of both Negro and white. The personnel director of the administration met with the Negro faculty to assure them that there would be no downgrading of their salaries or status and that no one would lose his job in the process of desegregation. By working so closely with all concerned, and especially by gaining the support of the Negro citizens, the school system was able to accomplish the final phase of total desegregation without resistance.

In preparation for this final transition, an inservice training program for secondary teachers, supported by a CRA Title IV grant, was begun in June 1967, to continue through May 1968. Among its three components was a summer laboratory school attended by Negro and white high school students and taught by an integrated faculty.

A second component was a seminar attended by the summer school faculty and other interested faculty members, administrators, and citizens. The first 2 weeks were devoted to the study of educational and social concerns as related to desegregation, with a workshop held during the last 2 weeks to plan various phases of the school desegregation program for 1967-68.

The final component included two parts, the first of which was the implementation of plans made in the summer workshop. The second part was a series of faculty seminars and some institutes attended by

administrators from surrounding school districts. By sharing ideas with other school districts, the Sherman school system was able to see its activities in better persepective, to gain new insights, and to pass on the lessons learned by experience in desegregation. The expressed interest of other communities contributed to a sense of pride among Sherman faculties and citizens and sparked their determination to make desegregation succeed both socially and educationally.

In planning this inservice program teachers were involved from the beginning, meeting with principals and consultants from the Consultative Center at Norman, Okla. They expressed their needs for the summer seminar as to both content and structure.

Letters of invitation to attend the 1967 summer school were sent to the homes of interested students, including all of the 93 Negro students who had never attended a desegregated school. These letters were distributed in order to introduce the summer program to the public. A total enrollment of 130 students was obtained, with a volunteer teaching staff of 40. Volunteer teachers were placed in groups of 15 as observers and helping teachers with several master teachers.

At the end of the summer program of teaching, seminar, and workshop, the Human Relations Committee, composed of teachers from the high school and both junior highs, distributed questionnaires to obtain evaluations from both teachers and students.

In answer to the question of whether teacher attitudes had been changed by the inservice program, participant reactions were summarized as follows:

> The consensus of the teachers was that they were already aware of the need for equalizing educational opportunity for all students. This program has re-emphasized the role of the teacher in individualizing instruction so that the needs of all students can be met. Stereotyping has been eliminated from the thinking of many of the teachers who previously had done so in misunderstanding of ethnic groups. The real job of education cannot come through forced human relations but through the individual teacher attempting to help each student build his self-image to the maximum. The Sherman teachers are so dedicated in every respect to carry out this type of program.

The major negative criticism was that certain key leaders of the school staff should have been in attendance, since they would be major forces in creating needed changes.

Evaluation questionnaires were also given to the students who participated in the summer program. Among the gains they listed were better understanding of fellow students and teachers of the other race, increased knowledge of the subject matter, a feeling that teachers were really interested in them and their problems, a more relaxed feeling about attending a desegregated school in 1967-68, and beginnings of friendships that will endure. With this profitable beginning, both teachers and students entered the totally desegregated Sherman school program with a wish to succeed and with fears greatly alleviated.

The continuation of the inservice program in 1967-68 focused on specific problems arising from desegregation. These included the wider range in student achievement levels, the increased number of disadvantaged students, and the tendency toward "voluntary segregation" among the students.

To remedy the first two problems innovation in instruction was encouraged. Though there was no overall restructuring of the school programs in either the elementary or secondary schools, teachers worked together

to increase individualization of instruction. Many teachers created new instructional methods in their own classrooms, bringing in up-to-date materials relevant to both races and setting up individual study programs with students. A tutorial program, financed through a local organization, began operation in 1965 and provides tutors for secondary students upon request.

Most teachers and administrators now point to "voluntary segregation" as the main problem in the Sherman secondary schools. A biracial "sounding board" meets frequently to give students a chance to share their feelings, and individual teachers of both races encourage Negro students to take part in school activities. Great improvement has been observed, and several teachers regard the students now in junior high as the promising group.

Attention to the achievement of integration within the desegregated schools has been continued in 1968-69 under a new superintendent, Dr. G. Wendell Hubbard. He also sees the need for a new emphasis on increased quality in education now that the logistics of desegregation are settled.